

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
LUCIO CELLI,

Plaintiff,

-v-

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.  
-----X

25-CV-2031 (JMF)

ORDER

JESSE M. FURMAN, United States District Judge:

On March 11, 2025, Plaintiff initiated this case with a “Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Writ of Prohibition, and Emergency Relief” seeking relief related to another case pending in this district, *Celli v. New York City, et al.*, No. 24-CV-9743 (JPC) (RWL). On May 1, 2025, Plaintiff filed identical “Emergency Motion[s] for Stay of Proceedings” in this case and in the related case, *see* ECF No. 10; No. 24-CV-9743, ECF No. 104. After his motion was denied in the related case, *see* No. 24-CV-9743, ECF No. 105, Plaintiff filed two additional motions in this case. First, he filed a “Motion for Reconsideration” addressed to the Magistrate Judge to whom the related case is referred. ECF No. 11. Second, he filed an “objection to Magistrate Judge’s Order and request for clarification and corrective relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a),” addressed both to the undersigned and to the judge in the related case. ECF No. 12.


Plaintiff’s three pending motions are denied as frivolous. It is well established that “a district court can stay or dismiss its own proceedings,” but “[o]ne district court cannot . . . stay the proceedings in another district court.” *Sedaker Grp. of S. California Inc. v. DirectBuy Inc.*, No. 14-CV-00636 (VAP), 2015 WL 13919071, at \*8 (C.D. Cal. May 15, 2015). That compels

denial of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Stay of Proceedings in the related case, ECF No. 10. Next, Plaintiff's objection and request for corrective relief related to the Magistrate Judge's Order in the related case, ECF No. 12, is denied because Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure "specifies that reconsideration of a magistrate's order, as provided for in the Magistrate's Act, shall be by the district judge to whom the case is assigned," Fed R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note (1983), namely the district judge in the related case. Finally, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's Order in the related case, ECF No. 11, is denied because it is addressed to the Magistrate Judge in the related case and is therefore filed on the wrong docket.

Plaintiff is admonished to avoid filing further motions in this case seeking relief in other actions before other judges. If he continues to do so, sanctions may be imposed. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate ECF Nos. 10, 11, and 12, and mail a copy of this Order to the Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 8, 2025  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSE M. FURMAN  
United States District Judge